USDC SDNY Case 1:20
DOCUMENT
ELECTRONICALLY FILED
DOC #:\_\_\_\_
DATE FILED: 10/09/2021

Case 1:21-cv-07863-VEC Document 59 Filed 10/09/21 Page 1 of 2

## GIBSON LAW FIRM, PLLC

SUJATA S. GIBSON, ESQ. 408 W Martin Luther King, Jr. St. Ithaca, New York 14850

MEMO ENDORSED

October 8, 2021

Writer Direct Cell Phone: 607-327-3284

## VIA ECF

Hon. Valerie E. Caproni United States District Court Southern District of New York Thurgood Marshall Courthouse 40 Foley Square, New York, NY 10007

Re: Kane, et al v. de Blasio, et al

Docket 21 civ 7863

Dear Judge Caproni,

Plaintiffs attach a witness list and list of additional exhibits to be addressed at Tuesday's preliminary injunction hearing with the witnesses. In addition, plaintiffs rely for this motion on all declarations, exhibits thereto and other factual materials submitted with the moving papers or supplemental papers.

Last, Plaintiffs wish to call Dr. Bhattacharya to give expert testimony about whether Plaintiffs pose a "direct threat" to others based on their vaccination status with this vaccine.

Dr. Bhattacharya was gracious enough to agree to appear and block off the morning. However, he is unable to fly here from Stanford on such short notice due to important appointments that were already in place which he cannot break on Monday and Wednesday.

I spoke to Attorney Minicucci last night about the matter. She initially indicated that it would probably be acceptable and that she would follow up in writing the next morning. However, today I received an email from counsel stating that they object on the grounds that Dr. Bhattacharya's testimony is "irrelevant."

I note that the memorandum of law just filed by Defendants indicates that they contest the facts that Dr. Bhattacharya is prepared to give expert testimony on. Therefore, I would respectfully ask that this Court allow him to testify by remotely by whatever method the Court prefers.

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Sujata S. Gibson

TELEPHONE: (607) 327-4125 EMAIL: SUJATA@GIBSONFIRM.LAW

## Counsel for the Plaintiffs

Cc: All counsel via ECF

Upon careful review of the parties' papers, the Court finds it unlikely that testimony from Dr. Bhattacharya, the ten Plaintiffs, and Petter Otto will be relevant to the Court's resolution of Plaintiffs' application for a preliminary injunction. Plaintiffs did not provide context as to the content of Amanda Nicole Ruiz's testimony, so the Court is unable to make an assessment as to the relevance of her testimony.

Plaintiffs' counsel must be prepared to discuss the relevancy of the testimony from Plaintiffs' proposed witnesses at the beginning of Tuesday's hearing. If the Court determines that the testimony is relevant, the Court will allow the witnesses available for in person testimony to testify at the hearing. With respect to Dr. Bhattacharya, if the Court finds that his testimony is relevant, the Court will hold the hearing open to accommodate either his remote testimony later that day or his in person testimony at a time that accommodates his schedule.

SO ORDERED.

Date: October 9, 2021

HON. VALERIE CAPRONI

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

TELEPHONE: (607) 327-4125 EMAIL: SUJATA@GIBSONFIRM.LAW